

The University of Chicago

THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATORS
OF AMOS

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1936

By
SHERMAN ELBRIDGE JOHNSON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1938

The University of Chicago

THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATORS
OF AMOS

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO
THE FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL
IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE OF
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1936

By
SHERMAN ELBRIDGE JOHNSON

Private Edition, Distributed by
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO LIBRARIES
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

1938



THE SEPTUAGINT TRANSLATORS OF AMOS

The methods of ancient translators were quite different from those of modern times. It is the ideal of modern translators that translated works be perfectly idiomatic and that the works so rendered be "at home" in the new language.¹ But no such motive impelled ancient translators of religious works, with the result that in the LXX we have the phenomenon called "translation Greek." Such Greek does not, however, always have the same idiosyncracies; the Greek of the Torah and of the book of Judges is much smoother, for example, than that of the prophets, and the differences between the old Greek version of Daniel and that of Theodotion are striking; the former is much more Hellenic.² In general it can be said that as the doctrine of the literal inspiration of scripture developed, the methods of translation became more and more literal and mechanical.

The late H. St. J. Thackeray pointed out the probability that the necessity of providing lections for synagogue worship influenced the translation of the Septuagint,³ and is responsible for peculiarities in the version of Jeremiah.⁴ This necessity may possibly explain a striking peculiarity in the old Greek version of Amos as we have it.⁵

¹Examples would be Gilbert Murray's translations of Euripides or T. E. Shaw's (Lawrence's) version of the Odyssey.

²A. P. Wikgren, A Comparative Study of the Septuagint and Theodotionic Versions of Daniel (Chicago: University of Chicago Libraries, 1932).

³"Septuagint" is an unfortunate name for the Greek Bible, except as applied to the Pentateuch. "Old Greek" is perhaps better.

⁴H. St. J. Thackeray, The Septuagint and Jewish Worship (London, 1921).

⁵The text used in this study is that of The Old Testament in Greek, edited by H. B. Swete (3rd ed.; Cambridge, 1905). The new manual edition, Septuaginta, edited by Alfred Rahlfs (Stuttgart,

Thackeray distinguishes two translators in Jeremiah.⁶ One, whom he calls Jer. α, works from 1:1 to 29:8; the other, Jer. β, carries the translation on to the end of the book. Each translator has his distinguishing marks. The prophetic formula, יהוה יהוה אלהינו, is rendered τάδε λέγει κύριος by Jer. α, but as οὕτως εἶπεν κύριος, by Jer. β. The other formula, יהוה אלהינו, is rendered λέγει by Jer. α, while β ordinarily uses φησὶν. On the other hand, the translators agree in rendering the divine Name יהוה אלהינו by κύριος παντοκράτωρ. Ezekiel is likewise the work of two translators, Ez. α, who rendered chapters 1-27 and 40-48 into Greek, and Ez. β, who translated chapters 28-39.⁷ There are a number of points of contact between Jer. α and Ez. α, while Jer. β and Ez. β stand alone. Thackeray further maintains that the translator of Ez. α, or his group, is responsible for the whole of the Minor Prophets. "I have failed to discover any similar mechanical break," he says, "in the Book of the Twelve; but in style and vocabulary the Greek Minor Prophets as a whole bear so close a resemblance to Ez. as to suggest that these large portions of the LXX may have been rendered by a single individual, some leading spirit in the little company."⁸

Thackeray placed great weight on the translation of יהוה אלהינו by κύριος παντοκράτωρ. In each case where יהוה אלהינו appears in Amos we have the word παντοκράτωρ in the Greek, with two exceptions, viz., 6:8, where no corresponding word is found in the

1935), which appeared after the study was largely completed, is frequently consulted. Readings which are studied are checked with Holmes and Parsons and with the Freer papyrus of the minor prophets, which Sanders designates W, a designation which is retained here. Because Swete, in his Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek (2nd ed.; Cambridge, 1914), designates the Codex Parisiensis as W, the Parisiensis is mentioned by name to avoid confusion.

⁶Thackeray, op. cit., pp. 28-37.

⁷Ibid., p. 38.

⁸Ibid., p. 29.

Greek, and 6:14, where the phrase κύριος τῶν δυνάμεων is found in Codices Vaticanus (B) and Venetus (V; Holmes and Parsons, 23), but is omitted by Alexandrinus (A) and Marchalianus (Q). There are two possibilities, one, that B and V have preserved an old reading; the other, that they have supplied the phrase to conform to the Hebrew text. But if the latter were the case, it would be likely that the copyist making the insertion would make his translation conform to the standard of the rest of Amos. In any case, the more difficult reading of B and V is preferable.

It is to be noticed that Thackeray nowhere dogmatizes on the absolute unity of the Book of the Twelve Prophets in its Greek dress. He suggests the presence of a company of translators, among whom Jer. 1:1--29:8, and Ezek. 1-27 and 40-48, and the twelve prophets were translated, and states his opinion that the minor prophets may be the work of a single person. In another place he suggests that the translators may have incorporated an older version made for lectionary use in the synagogue.⁹ It is quite possible that we may carry Thackeray's studies a stage further, and discover traces of an older version which has been incorporated into the present LXX Amos.

Herrmann and Baumgärtel sought to carry Thackeray's work to such a conclusion.¹⁰ They hold that Exekiel is the work of three translators, who dealt, respectively with chapters 1-27, 28-39, and 40-48, and find two translators in Isaiah, the dividing line coming at the end of chapter 39. While Thackeray had assigned the Book of the Twelve to one hand, they see two. Hosea,

⁹Ibid., p. 38.

¹⁰J. Herrmann and F. Baumgärtel, Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte der Septuaginta (Berlin, 1923). Herrmann deals with Ezekiel, pp. 1-19, and Baumgärtel with Isaiah, pp. 20-31, and the two collaborate on the Minor Prophets, pp. 32-38.

Amos, Micah, Joel, Obadiah, and Jonah belong to one translator, and Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, and Zechariah to the other; while Nahum is on the dividing line and cannot be assigned undoubtedly to either. The translator of the first six is designated α and the other as β .

When we consider the grounds upon which Amos is assigned to the same translator as the other five, we immediately find that the evidence is sorely conflicting. The method of these workers is to study agreements and disagreements in the translation of various Hebrew words, largely verbs. An analysis of Hermann and Baumgärtel's evidence shows that Amos solidly agrees with α in five places, viz., the use of $\tauίθημι$ in 8:10; $οὐαί$ in 5:16; $ισχυρός$ in 5:12, with Mic. 4:3, 7; Joel 1:6; 2:2; 5:11 against Zech. 8:22; $ὀλιγοστός$ in 7:2, 5 with Obad. 2 against Zech. 4:10; and in 4:3, Amos has $ἀπορρίπτω$ with Mic. 7:19; Jonah 2:4 (but Joel 1:7, $ρίπτω$) against occurrences of $ρίπτω$, $καθίημι$, and $ἐμβάλλω$ in Zechariah.

In three other cases, Amos is the only example of the alleged α translator adduced. These are as follows: 4:13, $κτίζω$ vs. Hab. 2:18; Zech. 1:13. Amos 2:16; 5:19; 9:1, $διαφεύγω$ vs. Nah. 2:9; Zech. 2:10; 14:5 (three times). Amos 3:13, $ἐπιμαρτύρομαι$ vs. Zech. 3:7; Mal. 2:14.

In seven cases, the testimony of Amos is quite conflicting, partly agreeing both with α and β , or with an internal conflict. In 3:10, we read $ἀδικία$ with α , but in 6:3, $ψευδής$. In 2:2; 6:9, $ἀποθνήσκω$ with Hos. 13:1; Jonah 4:4, 8; but also Hab. 1:12; Zech. 11:9 (twice); vs. $τελευτάω$, Amos 7:11, 17; 9:10. In Amos 5:17; 8:5, $διέρχομαι$, with Mic. 2:13; 5:7; Joel 4:17; Jonah 2:4; but also with Nah. 2:1; Hab. 1:11; Zech. 10:11; vs. $διαπορεύομαι$, Zeph. 2:15; Zech. 9:8; $παραπορεύομαι$, Zeph. 2:2. In 5:16;

7:4, Amos reads καλέω with Hos. 1:4, 6; 2:18 (twice); but also with Zech. 8:13; 11:7 (twice); Amos reads προσκαλέω in 5:8; 9:6 with Joel 3:5 vs. ἀνακράζω Zech. 1:14, 17; κράζω, Zech. 7:13; λαλέω, Zech. 7:7; and λέγω, Zech. 7:13. In Amos 7:10 we have ἐξ-αποστέλλω with Joel 2:19; 4:13; Mic. 6:4 and also Hag. 1:12; Zech. 1:10; 4:9; 7:2; Mal. 3:1 as against one occurrence of the verb ἀποστέλλω in α and five occurrences in the β books. Amos 6:8 reads ὕβρις with Hos. 5:5; 7:10 and also with Nah. 2:3 (twice); Zeph. 2:10; Zech. 9:6; 10:11; while Amos 8:7 reads ὑπερηφανία only with Obad. 3.

In 1:11, Amos takes an independent line, reading λυμαίνομαι against various α translations, and the διασφείρω used in Nah. 2:3; Zeph. 3:7; Mal. 1:14; 2:8; 3:11.

In three cases, Amos is definitely on the side of β. In 2:14, 15, it uses σώζω in harmony with four other occurrences in α, and nine other occurrences in β, as against διασώζω, used once in β and five times in α. In 1:6, 9, 15, Amos reads αἰχμαλωσία with Zech. 6:10; 14:2. In Amos 7:17; Mic. 2:4, 5, σχοινίον is used with Zeph. 2:5, 6, 7; and Zech. 2:5; while in Hos. 11:4; Mic. 2:10 another word is used.

In three cases, Amos definitely disagrees with the α group. It reads καταβιβάζω in 7:12 as against φάγω elsewhere in α. In 6:3, ψευδής is used in contrast with α and its own usage in 3:10. In Amos 7:11, 17; 9:10, there is disagreement with both α and β, and with Amos 2:2; 6:9.

We may summarize the internal disagreements within Amos which Herrmann and Baumgärtel's studies show, as follows: ἀπο-ενήσχω, 2:2; 6:9 vs. τελευτάω, 7:11, 17; 9:10. καλέω, 5:16; 7:4 vs. προσκαλέω, 5:8; 9:6. ὕβρις, 6:8 vs. ὑπερηφανία, 8:7. ἀδικία, 3:10 vs. ψευδής, 6:3.

Obviously, when evidence is so conflicting, the way is opened for an entirely new consideration of translation phenomena within the book of Amos itself.

When we examine the old Greek Amos further, we find certain other striking characteristics which run through the version. The translator has a feeling for the hif'il and seeks a method of representing it. His method is not a happy one. Instead of finding some Greek causative form, he has a habit of using a compound verb. In eleven occurrences of the hif'il perfect which were studied (2:9, 10; 3:1; 4:9; 5:7, 8, 12, 25; 7:1; 8:3; 9:7), a compound verb was used nine times by the translator (in all cases except 5:7 and 7:1). It is true that in three places (2:10; 3:1; 9:7), ἀνέγγαγον represents the Hebrew rather accurately. The translations are fairly good except in 5:8; 8:3, where compounds were certainly not required.

A similar phenomenon is seen when we study the hif'il perfect with waw consecutive. Of nineteen such occurrences, 1:5, 8, 14; 2:3; 3:11; 4:3, 7 (twice); 5:27; 6:8, 11; 8:3, 9 (twice), 10, 11; 9:8, 9, 13, a compound verb is used in twelve cases (all except 4:7; 6:11; 8:3; one instance in 8:9; 9:9). Compounds possibly were required in 3:11; 4:3; 5:27; 8:10; 9:8; certainly not in the other seven cases.

Of nine occurrences of the hif'il imperfect, 2:8, 13; 3:12; 5:3, 22; 7:16; 8:5, 6; 9:2, the compound verb is used six times. In no case except possibly in 5:3; 9:2 need compounds have been used. The results are not so conclusive for hif'il imperfect with waw consecutive. Of seven such occurrences, 2:4, 10, 11, 12; 4:10; 6:3; 9:10 (twice), there are two uses of compound verbs neither of which are required by the sense. Forms of the verb ἐγγίζω are used twice, 6:3; 9:10; a causative, ἐποτίζετε, is

used once, 2:12, and in one case, 2:11, the Hebrew text is doubtful, and the translation may not have read a hif'il. In 9:10 he seems to have mistaken $\square\tau\text{p}$ for $\square\text{p}$.

In eight occurrences of hif'il imperative, 3:9, 13; 4:1, 4, 5; 5:15, 23; 9:1, compound verbs are used six times (not in 4:4; 5:23), while the sense required them only in three cases. A hif'il infinitive absolute in 2:13 is translated by ἡ γέμουσα.

Nine occurrences of the hif'il infinitive construct were noted, 1:6, 9, 13; 6:10 (twice), 7:10; 8:4, 5 (twice). Five times compound verbs are used; in one of these cases, 8:4, the Hebrew text may, however, be corrupt. In 1:13 and 7:10 a compound was certainly not needed. In five cases, acrist infinitives with τοῦ are used. In one of these instances, a predicate adjective is used with ποιῆσαι to give a causative force (8:5). Likewise, in seven uses of the hif'il participle, 2:13; 4:13; 5:2, 9, 10, 13; 6:14, the translator uses compounds five times (in all cases except 2:13 where he translates very poorly; and 5:10). Compounds were needed only in 4:13; 5:12.

These statistics show that in 71 occurrences of the hif'il a Greek compound verb is used; in 22 cases it was necessary to give the sense of the Hebrew. However, in 23 cases either the compound verb is widely divergent from the Hebrew sense or another form might have been used more easily. Certainly the preponderance of the evidence points to the use of the compound verb as being a peculiarity of the version.

A strict system of literal representation would insure, generally speaking, that the same Hebrew tense would be translated by the same Greek tense. It would, moreover, insure a uniform vocabulary; the same root would be translated throughout by the same root, the same particle by the same particle. Numerous ex-

amples of this can be found in the old Greek version.

It may be questioned whether strict literal representation ever was, or could be, accomplished. It probably never could be carried out to the minutest detail, and the LXX Song of Songs approaches it as closely as would be possible under ordinary circumstances. It is usually said that Aquila did just this; but the best study of Aquila that has appeared up to the present time, that of Reider,¹¹ shows that despite his extreme literalism, the Jewish proselyte occasionally indulges in free translation and paraphrase, if the readings attributed to him are genuine (cf. especially pp. 34 f.). Aquila does not in every case represent אֱלֹהִים by οὐς as is sometimes alleged (cf. p. 16 n.). Reider has furthermore shown that in Aquila the Hebrew perfect is largely rendered by the Greek aorist, the perfect with waw consecutive by καί with the future; imperfect by future, with aorist for the imperfect frequentative or iterative; but even here there is no absolute uniformity (cf. pp. 42-51). Genitives absolute are even used occasionally, as in Isa. 30:29; Exod. 4:10, etc. We therefore must say that systematic representation is approached in many passages, and that the Song of Songs closely approximates it, as we shall see.

However, we find that the version of Amos occupies an intermediate stage between true translation and systematic representation. The kal perfect is usually rendered by aorist indicative, the same form with waw consecutive by future active, the kal imperfect with future active or aorist subjunctive, and kal imperfect with waw consecutive by aorist indicative. There are some exceptions, and of these some can be accounted for on the

¹¹ J. Reider, Prolegomena to a Greek-Hebrew and Hebrew-Greek Index to Aquila (Philadelphia, 1916).

ground that they are accurate translations, while others are decidedly peculiar.

We may proceed to note some of these peculiarities. Perfect active indicative is used to translate *kal* perfect in 5:15, 21, while perfect middle is used in 5:21; present active indicative is used in 7:8; 8:2 (ἤκει); and present middle with a noun of direct object in 7:10.

In translating *kal* perfect with *waw* consecutive, aorist subjunctive is used only in 5:19; and aorist active is found in chapters 1, 5, and 7, and future passive in 6:7. Furthermore, chapters 7-9 adhere rather closely to futures (except for 7:4), and these are the same chapters which in rendering *kal* perfect without *waw* used present tenses.

While future active and aorist subjunctive are usually used to render the *kal* imperfect, imperfects are sometimes used. Thus the imperfect active occurs twice, 2:7, 8, and the imperfect middle deponent once, 2:7. A present active indicative is found once, 5:22; the present imperative three times, 5:5 (twice for jussives), 6; a present active participle twice, 5:9; 9:5; and a present middle participle once, 6:6. Aorist subjunctives are used in chapter 5.

Similarly a peculiarity occurs in the translation of *kal* imperative. While the aorist imperative is customarily used, we find twice an aorist active indicative, 4:4, 5 (compound verb); a future middle once, 5:4 (for a *kal* imperative with *waw*), and a perfect active twice, 5:15.¹² One should note that here, as in the case of *kal* perfect with *waw* consecutive, the Greek perfect is peculiar to chapter 5.

¹² In each case there is a change of person from second to first. Was the translator's Hebrew text corrupt?

Peculiarities are also found in translation of the *kal* active participle, viz., perfect active participle in 5:16; 6:1; 9:11; and *pi'el* infinitive absolute, viz., present active participle in 5:6; 6:3; and present middle participle, 6:8, 10.

While the *hif'il* perfect is usually rendered by the aorist active, we find present active participles in 5:8, 12. The *hif'il* imperfect is translated in a variety of ways, e.g., future passive in 5:3. The same form with *waw* consecutive is most often translated by the aorist active, but in 6:3 by a present active participle.

The familiar emphatic construction of infinitive absolute and imperfect is once translated by *τοῦ* with an aorist infinitive, 3:5, and once by a present middle participle and a future passive. The Hebrew phrase which occurs in 5:5, is, however, translated αἰχμάλωτος ἀχθήσεται in 7:11 and 7:17, a fact to which we shall refer again later.

Evidence so far would appear to suggest that chapters 5 and 6 stand off from the rest of the version, with a slight possibility that chapters 7 and 9 are also different from chapters 1-4.

In the course of reading the Greek Amos, notable agreements and disagreements in different portions of the work in translation of the same Hebrew word were noted down. Of course, there are numerous minor agreements, as in the translation of *לָעָג* by λέγει, which by themselves would prove little or nothing; so the more striking occurrences of important Hebrew words were studied.

The word *בָּזָל*, "poor," is rendered *πτωχὸν* in 2:7 and *πτωχοῦς* in 4:1.¹³ A noun from the root *בָּזָל*, "oppress," "defraud,"

¹³ *πτωχοῦς* and *πενητας* are transposed in A Q 26 49 106 198 (Hes.), also in 233 (Luc.), which, however, reads *πενητα* for B *πτωχοῦς*.

"extort," is translated καταδυναστείαν in 3:9; the participle of the verb is rendered αἱ καταδυναστευοῦσαι in 4:1. Likewise a noun from ὕψις is ἀσεβείαις in 1:3, while in 4:4 from the verb we have ἡσεβήσατε.¹⁴ In 1:2, ἐξηράνθη translates a form of ὑγρῶς; from the same verb comes a form translated ξηρανθήσεται in 4:7. מ'רררר in 2:11 is rendered νεανισκῶν; νεανίσκους in 4:10. The verb ררר becomes ἐξέκλιναν in 2:7; ἐκκλίνοντες in 5:12.

In 5:5, διαβαίνετε¹⁵ renders a form of ררר; the same verb gives διάβητε in 6:2, the forms in the Hebrew being different. The noun ררר is rendered ὀργάνων in 5:23 and 6:5. רררר is rendered δικαιοσύνη in 5:24 and δικαιοσύνης in 6:12.

In 7:12 and 7:15, βάδιζε renders a form of ררר. In 5:8 and 9:6, καὶ ἐκχέων αὐτό occurs to render ררררר. In 7:9, ἀφανισθήσονται, and τὰς ἡφανισμένας in 9:14,¹⁶ render forms of ררר.

These results readily arrange themselves in a table, as follows:

1:2	4:7
1:3	4:4 (?)
2:7	4:1
2:7	5:12
2:11	4:10
3:9	4:1
5:5 (?)	6:2
5:23	6:5
5:24	6:12
5:8	9:6
7:12	7:15
7:9	9:14

With two exceptions, these occurrences arrange themselves into three groups: chapters 1-4, 5-6, 7-9. No other such grouping appears to be possible. This by itself would prove little because of the differences in vocabulary as between different sec-

¹⁴ ηγουμεσατε is read for ησεβησατε by Q and thirteen minuscules representing both Lucianic and Hexaplaric recensions.

¹⁵ αναβαινετε for διαβαινετε is read by AQ and ten minuscules.

¹⁶A few minuscules read ηδαφισμενας.

tions. It does, however, show that within a section the translation of a root is somewhat standardized.

More striking results are obtained when we collect examples of disagreements, i.e., cases in which the same Hebrew root is differently rendered in different sections of the Greek.

For the root $\lambda\dot{\nu}\dot{\psi}$, we have $\epsilon\phi\theta\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\alpha\tau\omicron$ in 1:2 and $\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ (Lucianic $\acute{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\pi\epsilon\acute{\upsilon}\xi\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$) in 3:4, 8. In the first case the verb is used of the roaring of Yahweh, in the other cases of that of the lion.

In 1:10 and elsewhere in chapters 1 and 2, $\theta\epsilon\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\alpha$ translates לללללל , while in 6:8, $\chi\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha\varsigma$ is used. Here perhaps ללללל was read, however.

In 2:2 and 6:9, $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\nu\eta\sigma\kappa\omega$, and in 7:11, 17; 9:10, $\tau\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\omega$ (Herrmann and Baumgärtel).

$\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\kappa\epsilon\nu$ in 2:6 translates ללללל , while in 8:6 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\acute{\iota}$ is used.

In 2:7, ב'קללל becomes $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\eta\nu\tau\alpha$,¹⁷ but $\omicron\iota$ $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ in 8:4. (Some MSS read $\theta\lambda\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ or $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\theta\lambda\acute{\iota}\beta\omicron\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma$ for the latter.) ב'לל is rendered $\tau\alpha\pi\epsilon\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\nu$ in 2:7, while in 8:4 it becomes $\pi\tau\omega\chi\acute{o}\varsigma$.

In 3:12, we find $\tau\eta\varsigma$ $\phi\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma$ (W, $\phi\upsilon\lambda\eta\varsigma$) for MT ללל , "bed," while in 6:4 the plural is properly rendered $\kappa\lambda\iota\nu\acute{\omega}\nu$. The probable explanation is that the Hebrew word was confused with ללל , "branch," "staff," "tribe." One might be inclined to think that in the former case the translator's text was corrupt, but for the fact that the same verse, 3:12, contains another blunder. The

¹⁷ $\tau\acute{\alpha}$ $\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\eta\nu\tau\alpha$, Q 48 233; $\tau\acute{\omega}\nu$ $\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\upsilon\eta\nu\tau\omega\nu$, 22 87 91. It is to be noted that this textual variant does not change the main principle, i.e., that a different root from the one used in 8:4 is used in 2:7. All these disagreements have been checked in this manner, and henceforth will be noted only when they appear to affect the results.

Greek word ἱερεῖς is used to render שָׂרָף,¹⁸ "couch," "divan"; the word is properly translated στρατιῶν in 6:4. The translator of 3:12, not understanding the Hebrew, probably wrote a transliteration שָׂרָף, which an early copyist changed to ἱερεῖς.¹⁹

The word שָׂרָף, "violence," "oppression," is translated ἀδικίαν in 3:10 and ψευδῶν in 6:3 (Herrmann and Baumgärtel).

In 4:2, שָׂרָף is rendered καὶ τοὺς μεθ' ὧν while in 9:1, שָׂרָף becomes καὶ τοὺς καταλοιποὺς αὐτῶν. The latter translation is preferable. The word γυναί in 4:3 is a complete misunderstanding of שָׂרָף, a noun rendered τὰ πεπτωκότα in 9:11. In 4:11, κατέστρεψα translates a form of שָׂרָף; we have μεταστρέψω for it in 8:10.

In chapters 4 and 5, שָׂרָף is regularly translated παντοκράτωρ; in 6:14, τῶν δυνάμεων;²⁰ while in 9:5 the translation

¹⁸ Pausal for שָׂרָף.

¹⁹ The difficulty which the ancient textual students had with this passage is illustrated by the following variants noted by W. O. E. Oesterley, Studies in the Greek Version of Amos (Cambridge, 1902), p. 35:

ἐν Δαμασκῶ Q (Hes.)]	+ κλινῇ Qmg κλίνει 68 87 91 238 (Hes.)
ἐν Δ. ἱερεῖς (Hes.)]	ἐν Δ. κλίνει ἱερεῖς 22 (Luc.)
	ἐκ Δαμασκου κλίνει ι. 36
	ἐν Δαμασκῶ κλίνει ι. 36 ^a
	ἐν Δαμασκῶ κλινῇ ι. 62
	Δαμασκου tantum 95 185
	καὶ ἐν Δαμασκῶ κλίνει 147 ^{ut vid}
	ἐν Δαμασκῶ 147 ^a
ἱερεῖς] pr oi 185	
	ἱερεῖς 147
	ι. του κυριου 22mg ut vid

Obviously an early corrector wrote the proper translation and in the Lucianic recension we have the familiar conflation. It is to be noted that W, the Washington MS of the minor prophets, reads ἱερεῖς; cf. H. A. Sanders and Carl Schmidt, The Minor Prophets in the Freer Collection and the Berlin Fragment of Genesis (New York, 1927), p. 56.

²⁰ Oesterley, op. cit., p. 49, gives:

λεγει κυριος των δυναμεων]	om AQ (Hes.)
BV	οησι κς ο θς των δυναμεων 68 87 91
	238 (Hes.)
	λεγει κς ο θς των στρατιωτων 26 49
	106 (Hes.)

misunderstanding of the verb שָׁתָּק, "to plow," which can also mean "to keep silence." A participle of the same verb in 9:13 is properly rendered ὁ ἄμνητος.²²

In 7:9 we find καὶ αἱ τελευταί to translate שְׁתַּכְנִי; the same noun is ἀγίασμα in 7:13.

The unusual form בָּנִי²³ is translated γέλωτος, "of laughter," in 7:9; in 7:16 we have Ἰακώβ (which is read even by W). Perhaps the problem here is textual; but did the translator originally write Ἰσαάκ?

The same Hebrew form, בָּרַךְ, is translated ὁρᾷς in 7:8 and βλέπεις in 8:1 (2).²⁴

The familiar קִנְיָ construction with infinitive construct is rendered by aorist subjunctive (προσθῶ) in 7:8 and by future (προσθήσεις) in 7:13.²⁵

A form of the verb בָּרַךְ is translated ἀνασπάσει in 9:2, while in the next verse another form is rendered καὶ λήψομαι.

If, now, we tabulate the disagreements, we receive the following results:

²² V, Cod. Parisiensis, and eighteen minuscules read ὁ ἀλοητός.

²³ Found four times in poetical books for בָּנִי, "Isaac" (F. Brown, S. R. Driver, and C. A. Briggs, A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament, ad loc.). The name of course comes from בָּנִי, "laugh," "play," "jest."

²⁴ Two MSS read ὁρᾷς for βλέπεις, viz., 26 (Hes.), 153 (Luc.). 49 (Hes.) reads οραίς. W omits τί σου βλέπεις Ἄμω; καὶ εἶπα ἄγγος Ἰεζουτὺ καὶ εἶπεν.

²⁵ But here the text is doubtful. προσθῶ is supported by B and apparently by W; by Q^a 68 87 91 106 238 (Hes.) and 22 (Luc.), but προσθήσω is read by Q (Hes.) and 36 (Luc.) and five other minuscules. For οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῶ, 26 (Hes.) reads οὐ μὴ προσθήσω. On the other hand, προσθήσεις in 7:13 is supported by B and 22 (Luc.); while Q (Hes.) 62 233 (Luc.), also V and five minuscules, read προσθῆς and 147 (Luc.) προσθείς. For οὐκέτι μὴ προσθῆς προφητεῖσαι, the Hesychian reading, 26 (Hes.) reads οὐκ ἔτι οὐ μὴ προσητεύσεις.

(chap. 1)	1:2	vs.	3:4, 8
	1:10, etc.	vs.	6:8 (?)
(chap. 2)	2:2 and 6:9	vs.	7:11, 17; 9:10
	2:6	vs.	8:6
	2:7	vs.	8:4
	2:7	vs.	8:4
(chap. 3)	3:4, 8	vs.	1:2
	3:10	vs.	6:3
	3:12	vs.	6:4
	3:12	vs.	6:4
(chap. 4)	4:2	vs.	9:1
	4:3	vs.	9:11
	4:11	vs.	8:10
	chaps. 4, 5 with 9:5	vs.	6:14 (?)
	4:2	vs.	6:8
(chap. 5)	5:5	vs.	7:11, 17
	5:5	vs.	8:14
	5:8 and 9:6	vs.	5:16; 7:4
	5:16 and 7:4	vs.	5:8; 9:6
	5:25	vs.	6:3; 9:10
(chap. 6)	6:3	vs.	3:10
	6:3	vs.	5:25
	6:4	vs.	3:12
	6:8	vs.	1:10, etc. (?)
	6:8	vs.	8:7
	6:8	vs.	4:2
	6:9 and 2:2	vs.	7:11, 17; 9:10
	6:10	vs.	8:3
	6:12	vs.	9:13
	6:14 (?)	vs.	chaps. 4, 5
(chap. 7)	7:4 and 5:16	vs.	5:8; 9:6
	7:8	vs.	7:13
	7:8	vs.	8:1 (?)
	7:9	vs.	7:13
	7:9	vs.	7:16
	7:11, 17; 9:10	vs.	2:2; 6:9
	7:11, 17	vs.	5:5
(chap. 8)	8:1 (?)	vs.	7:8
	8:3	vs.	6:10
	8:4	vs.	2:7
	8:6	vs.	2:6
	8:7	vs.	6:8
	8:10	vs.	4:11
	8:14	vs.	5:5
(chap. 9)	9:1	vs.	4:2
	9:2	vs.	9:3
	9:5	vs.	6:14
	9:6 and 5:8	vs.	5:16; 7:4
	9:10	vs.	5:25
	9:10 and 7:11, 17	vs.	2:2; 6:9
	9:11	vs.	4:3
	9:13	vs.	6:12

The greatest number of disagreements appears in chapter 6, which disagrees ten times with other chapters; the next greatest is in chapter 9, with eight disagreements.

We have seen that chapters 5 and 6 have peculiarities in the translation of Hebrew moods and tenses. If we divide the chapters into three groups, viz., (A) chapters 1-4, (B) chapters 5-6, (C) chapters 7-9, and tabulate the disagreements within the groups and between the groups, we obtain the following results.

DISAGREEMENTS

Within Group A	1
Within Group B	3
Within Group C	6
Between Groups A and B	6
Between Groups A and C	8
Between Groups B and C	9

While it is not claimed that this tabulation is exhaustive, it is claimed that it does contain the most striking cases of disagreement, and is a fair sampling of the translation phenomena of Amos. Its reliability is confirmed by the fact that study of the notable agreements also points to the same grouping of chapters. The peculiarities in translation of the verb also suggest that chapters 5 and 6 are in a class by themselves.

It should further be noted that the total length of chapters 1-4 is 59 verses, that of chapters 5-6, 41 verses, and that of chapters 7-9, 46 verses. This tends to accentuate the individuality of the two chapters in question; they fairly bristle with disagreements. The force of the disagreements between Groups A and C is correspondingly weakened.

In only one case is there a divergence within the group so great as any of the divergences between the groups. Group C shows signs of less systematic and more erratic translation than do the other groups; but some of these disagreements in Group C are complicated by textual uncertainty.

A simple hypothesis may explain these peculiarities; viz., that although the old Greek version of Amos is the work of one

school of translators, in its present form at least, and all its parts are of roughly the same date, two hands at least have been at work on it. Chapters 5 and 6 are certainly from a different hand than that which produced the other parts. There are some dissimilarities between chapters 1-4 and chapters 7-9, but similarities appear in the handling of אָלְהִים, and in the translation of verbs.

It is possible to suppose that more than one hand has worked on chapters 1-4, 7-9, but that is to multiply hypotheses. It is better to assume a translator who is not rigidly consistent. There are differences within chapters 5 and 6, but the differences are not great enough to assume more than one translator.

Chapters 5 and 6 are important for their religious teaching, e.g., the day of the Lord (5:18 ff.), the great saying in 5:24, and the denunciation of luxury in 6:3 ff.; and this section may have been translated first for lectionary purposes. Shortly thereafter, men of similar methods completed the rendering of Amos into Greek, perhaps reworking chapters 5 and 6 slightly.

The next stage in the study is that of collecting various peculiarities in translation shown by a word for word comparison of the Massoretic text and the Greek text, both being read critically. When these phenomena are collected, it is found that they may be subsumed under certain categories.

(1) Misrenderings of ambiguous words, i.e., words that could be taken to have two or more meanings, either as they stand in the MT or with very slight changes in pointing, e.g., 1:5, 12, 14; 3:7, 15; 4:5; 6:12; 8:8.

(2) Misrenderings of words that should not be ambiguous. 1:6, 11; 2:3, 8; 4:12, 13 (?); 5:5, 22, 24; 6:12.

(3) Confusion between daleth and resh. 1:1; 3:9; 4:5; 7:1.

(4) Other variations caused by misunderstanding of the Hebrew language. 2:7; 3:5; 4:2; 5:8; 7:7; 8:1, 3, 14.

(5) Divergences in number and person. 3:10; 4:5; 5:7, 15, 19, 25; 6:1; 8:9.

(6) Syntax: the verb is taken with the wrong noun. 5:1, 2, 14.

The first six categories naturally form a group.

(7) Paraphrase. 2:7, 8; 3:15; 4:2, 4; 7:2, 12.

(8) Explanatory additions. 1:3; 2:8, 16; 3:4, 11.

(9) Strikingly idiomatic Greek. 5:5, 11; 6:6.

(10) The so-called double rendering. 5:8; 6:3.

These four latter categories form a group. An eleventh is made by divergences which are possibly to be explained on textual grounds. 2:2; 4:8, 9; 5:9; 6:6; 7:1; 9:1.

The misrenderings of ambiguous words belong largely to the early chapters; there is one occurrence, however, in chapter 6, and one in chapter 8. Chapter 5, it must be said, has its share of misrenderings; but the Hebrew of this chapter is extremely difficult. The dalet-h-resh confusions are widely scattered, as are the miscellaneous variations (one occurs in chapter 5).

Chapter 5 stands almost alone in its divergences in number and person, and the two syntactical blunders occur in it. The paraphrase phenomenon is most prominent in early chapters, and does not occur in chapters 5 and 6. The explanatory additions are likewise confined to the early chapters. The most striking Greek idioms are found in chapters 5 and 6, and in chapters 5 and 6 occur the "double rendering." The variations which are to be classed as "possibly textual" are scattered throughout the book, as might be expected.

In order to check his results, the writer made two other

studies using the same methods, choosing Gen. 24-27 as an example of the earliest stratum of the LXX, and the whole of the Song of Songs as an example of the latest stratum. The Song of Songs comes much closer to what we mean by "literal representation," and in this respect compares favorably with Aquila. Great uniformity is found in the translation of stems and tenses, and certain mistranslations, such as the rendering of לִי by $\alpha\delta\epsilon\lambda\omicron\iota\delta\acute{o}\varsigma$, run through the entire version. When various tags of poetry are found in different places in the Song, the translation is almost word for word the same. One might note as examples 2:6 and 8:3; 2:17 and 4:6; 3:3 and 5:7; and 2:7; 3:5; 5:8; 8:4. The Song of Songs was obviously translated by a single person who adhered quite closely to a system of literal representation.

The Genesis chapters were chosen because they constitute a continuous passage not much longer than Amos or the Song of Songs. Furthermore, a very thorough study of the Greek Genesis has been made by Dr. O. J. Baab,²⁶ who has classified most of the translational phenomena of the book. He has not, however, approached Genesis by means of the method used in the preceding chapters. Baab maintains that Genesis is the work of two translators, one of whom (α) translated Gen. 1-25, while the other (β) had charge of Gen. 26-50. His argument may be briefly summarized as follows.

Translator α habitually used the form $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, while β used $\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$; α used $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron$, while the other used $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\tau\omicron\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}$. There is a certain amount of overlapping in use of these words, although it is slight. In the translation of לִי , α uses $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$

²⁶"The Character of the Greek Translation of the Book of Genesis," unpublished Ph. D. dissertation (University of Chicago Libraries, 1928).

fifteen times and β uses it seven times, while the latter uses $\pi\epsilon\delta\iota\sigma$ twelve times to the other's seven. Translator β is the poorer linguist; he commits dittography 116 times to the other's 72; haplography, 32 to 23; additions of a letter, 18 to 12; omissions of a letter, 23 to 9; midrashic expositions (under which class Baab subsumes a number of phenomena), 256 to 175. He gives instances of different modes of translating various roots, and in one point his argument is weak. In the translation of the verb פָּלַל , he shows that α uses $\epsilon\pi\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ three times to the other's twice; while β uses $\acute{\alpha}\gamma\epsilon\iota\nu$ nine times to two, $\kappa\alpha\rho\alpha\gamma\acute{\iota}\gamma\nu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota$ six times to one, $\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ eight times to two, $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\phi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\epsilon\iota\nu$ twice while α does not use it at all, $\eta\chi\epsilon\iota\nu$ seven times to one. This merely shows either that not all the instances of occurrence of פָּלַל have been studied, or that it is of so infrequent occurrence in chapters 1-25 that it may well be left out of account.

However, one may regard Baab's generalization as being one of the "assured results of research" and therefore of value as a comparison for our study. He has established his theory of two translators.

After making a thorough study of the translation of the Hebrew verb in these chapters, it was found that the habits for translation of the *kal* perfect and imperfect with and without *waw* consecutive are already well established. In the large majority of cases the Greek rendering is a good one and faithfully carries over the force of the Hebrew form; there are not nearly so many exceptions to this as in Amos. Furthermore, as between the four chapters under consideration there is little difference in the methods used in translating. The two translators do not divide on the method of translating tenses.

Much of Baab's argument was based upon the occurrences of

καὶ ἐγένετο and ἐγένετο δέ in the Greek Genesis. In the chapters under consideration, the Hebrew 'וַיְהִי is translated as follows: καὶ ἐγένετο, 24:15, 30, 67; 27:30 (twice); ἐγένετο δέ, 24:22, 52; 25:11; 26:1, 8, 14, 32; 27:1; ἦν δέ, 26:34. Chapter 24 vacillates between the two forms, while chapter 25, which is supposed to belong to translator α, uses ἐγένετο δέ in the sole occurrence of the Hebrew expression. It is easy to see that Baab's method will not produce results if applied to a smaller section than the whole book of Genesis. The methods of the two translators were too nearly alike; and it is necessary to take statistics based on occasional differences scattered through a number of chapters to show that there is more than one translator. On the basis of the studies made in this chapter one would be tempted to regard chapters 24 and 25 as transitional chapters exhibiting some of the habits of both translators. This is not to say that Baab's method was wrong. It merely shows that no such striking differences occur in Genesis as occur, for example, in Amos.

Likewise, in a study of translations of words, negative results are found. There are a number of common words which run through the four chapters and the translation of these is rather consistently the same, but this in itself would prove little. A table of differences of unusual words was therefore made, on the basis of Baab's division of chapters. In the first group, viz., chapters 24 and 25, there were eleven divergences within the group and in the second group, chapters 26 and 27, there were five. Between the two groups there were but two divergences.

Although Dr. Baab has shown by other methods that there are probably two translators at work on the section, the results of this independent study are largely negative. So much the more weight is to be assigned to the very real differences which crop

out in the translation of Amos in the rendering of stems and tenses, in the translation of unusual Hebrew roots, and in other types of translation phenomena.

Amos thus stands apart from the large books, such as Genesis, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, which were definitely assigned to two translators. A fragment of Amos was probably translated at an early date, after which another translator completed the work. Thus a man of very different gifts worked on the remainder of Amos, and the results were correspondingly different.

We may now proceed to summarize the arguments for the existence of a separate translator of Amos 5 and 6.

First, these chapters have certain peculiarities in the rendering of Hebrew verbs. Twice the kal perfect is translated by Greek perfects (5:15, 21); with waw consecutive, aorist subjunctive (5:19), aorist active (5:26), and future passive (6:7) are used in contrast to the methods in other chapters. Most of the aorist subjunctives used to translate kal imperfect are in chapter 5. The only renderings of this Hebrew tense by present tenses are in these chapters, with one exception (in chapter 9): present indicative (5:22), present imperative (5:5, 6), present active participle (5:9), and present middle participle (6:6) are the forms used. Two peculiarities in translation of the kal imperative are found here--future middle (5:4) and perfect active (5:15) being used. The kal active participle is in these chapters rendered by the perfect active participle (5:16; 6:1; elsewhere only in 9:11).

The pi'el infinitive absolute in chapters 5 and 6 is translated by a present active participle (5:6; 6:3) and present middle participle (6:8, 10). The hif'il perfect is rendered by the present active participle in 5:8, 12, and the hif'il imperfect

by the future passive in 5:3.

Second, when we examine the striking agreements in translation of notable Hebrew words, the agreements fall into three classes, with chapters 4, 5-6, and 7-9 standing apart from one another. There are but two exceptions.

Third, the same thing is true when we consider the striking disagreements in rendering of Hebrew vocabulary. The disagreements within the groups (with the possible exception of the third group) are negligible; the differences between the groups are so remarkable that they are hardly to be explained except by the hypothesis of different translators.

Finally, when we take up, verse by verse, the divergences of the Greek from the Massoretic Text, the groups of chapters show characteristic phenomena, with chapters 5 and 6 most different from the others. The dalet-hesh confusion apparently does not appear in chapters 5 and 6. Most of the divergences from the Hebrew in number and person occur in these chapters. The two syntactical mistakes in which the verb is taken with the wrong noun occur in chapter 5. The paraphrases and explanatory additions do not occur in these chapters, but in three places in chapters 5 and 6 there are strikingly idiomatic Greek phrases, and one "double rendering."

These arguments are of cumulative force. They make it probable that the two chapters in question are the work of an earlier and more scholarly translator who had, however, some "blind spots." He had extremely difficult chapters to translate and on the whole accomplished his task much better than did the translator of chapter 4. His method was largely that of systematic representation, but he belonged to a school of men who were less literalistic than Aquila. The chief peculiarity of members of this school was their custom of rendering the hif'il by a compound Greek verb.

